



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/771,809	02/03/2004	Hank Risan	MOMI-015	3341

7590 09/12/2008
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER	
BESROUR, SAOUSSEN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/771,809

Applicant(s)

RISAN ET AL.

Examiner

SAOUSSEN BESROUR

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/02)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/9/2005.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the communication filed 2/3/2004.
2. Claims 1-44 were received for consideration.
3. No preliminary amendments for the claims were filed. Currently claims 1-44 are under consideration.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1, 5, 14, 16, 21, 31, 37, 43 and 44 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 9, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19 and 22 of copending Application No. 10/772025. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because 10/772025 is directed towards a method of preventing unauthorized recording

of electronic media by activating a compliance mechanism, controlling a data path and directing media content to customer device.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 1-44** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Doherty et al. (6,920,567).

As per **claim 1**, Doherty discloses: installing a compliance mechanism on a computer system, said compliance mechanism communicatively coupled with said computer system when installed thereon, said compliance mechanism for enforcing compliance with a usage restriction applicable to said media (Column 4, Lines 15-34); obtaining control of a data pathway operable on said computer system (Column 4, Lines 15-34);
accessing data disposed on said media storage device to determine said usage

restriction (Column 4, Lines 15-34, Column 5, Lines 46-67); and selectively preventing said computer system from digitally accessing said media via said data pathway while enabling presentation of the media (Column 4, Lines 15-34, Column 5, Lines 46-67).

As per **claim 16**, Doherty discloses: a compliance mechanism disposed on said media storage device and configured to be installed on and communicatively coupled with a computer system, said compliance mechanism for enforcing compliance with a usage restriction applicable to said media (Column 4, lines 15-34); a device drive coupled with said computer system for accessing said media storage device, said device drive communicatively coupled with an analog sound rendering device of said computer system (column 23, Lines 46-67); and wherein said compliance mechanism is configured to selectively prevent access to said media via a digital data pathway of said computer system while presenting said media via said analog sound rendering device (column 23, Lines 46-67).

As per **claim 31**, Doherty discloses: invoking an autorun protocol disposed on said media storage device in response to a device drive coupled with said computer system receiving said media storage device, said autorun protocol for installing a compliance mechanism on said computer system (Column 5, Lines 46-Column 6, Lines 6, Column 15, Lines 11-30); installing said compliance mechanism on said computer system, said compliance mechanism communicatively coupled with said computer system when installed

thereon, said compliance mechanism for providing compliance with a usage restriction associated with said media (Column 4, lines 15-34);
acquiring control of a digital data pathway of said computer system with a filter driver coupled with said compliance mechanism and with said computer system, said filter driver installed during said installing of said compliance mechanism (column 23, Lines 46-67); and selectively restricting said media on said media storage device from being accessed via said digital data pathway while enabling presentation of said media using an analog sound rendering device communicatively coupled with said device drive (column 23, Lines 46-67).

As per **claim 2**, rejected as applied to claim 1. Doherty discloses: wherein said usage restriction comprises a copyright restriction or a licensing agreement associated with said media (Column 4, Lines 15-34).

As per **claim 3, 17 and 22**, Doherty discloses: installing a filter driver on said computer system, said filter driver configured to be coupled with and operable in conjunction with said compliance mechanism and for controlling said data pathway (Fig. 1A and 2 Column 23, Lines 47-60).

As per **claim 4**, Doherty discloses: said filter driver prevents digitally accessing said media (Fig. 1A and 2 Column 23, Lines 47-60).

As per **claim 5, 15, 20, 24, 30, 38 and 44**, Doherty discloses: activating an autorun mechanism disposed on said media storage device in response to a device drive coupled with said computer system receiving said media storage device, said autorun mechanism for initiating said installing said compliance mechanism on said computer system (Column 5, Lines 46-Column 6, lines 6, Column 15, Lines 11-30).

As per **claim 6**, Doherty discloses: presenting said media using an analog sound rendering device communicatively coupled with said device drive via an analog signal path (Column 9, Lines 50-67).

As per **claim 7, 21 and 23**, Doherty discloses: wherein said autorun mechanism is activated in response to detection of a usage restriction indicator disposed on said media storage device, subsequent to said device drive receiving said media storage device (Column 4, Lines 15-34 and Column 5, Lines 46-Column 6, Lines 6).

As per **claim 8**, Doherty discloses: wherein said autorun mechanism is activated in response to detection of a selection of an icon representing said media (Column 5, Lines 46-Column 6, lines 6, Column 15, Lines 11-30).

As per **claim 9 and 32**, Doherty discloses: bypassing said installing said compliance mechanism on said computer system if an instance of said compliance mechanism is predisposed on said computer system (Column 23, Lines 47-60).

As per **claim 10, 18, 19, 33 and 34**, Doherty discloses: initiating a communication session between said computer system and a network to which said computer system is coupled and from which said compliance mechanism is available; comparing said compliance mechanism present on said computer system and said compliance mechanism available from said network; and updating said compliance mechanism on said computer system (Column 16, Lines 58-Column 17, Lines 45).

As per **claim 11, 26 and 40**, Doherty discloses: deactivating said compliance mechanism upon detection of uncoupling of said media storage device from said computer system (Column 34, Lines 6-41).

As per **claim 12, 27 and 41**, Doherty discloses: uninstalling said compliance mechanism upon detection of uncoupling of said media storage device from said computer system (Column 4, Lines 6-41).

As per **claim 13, 28, and 42**, Doherty discloses: wherein said media storage device upon which said media is disposed is from a group of media storage devices consisting of a compact disk (CD), a mini CD, a digital versatile disk (DVD), a mini DVD, a compact flash card, a secure digital (SD) card, a memory stick, a digital audio tape (DAT), a digital video tape (DVT), a holographic storage object, a magneto-optical disk,

a multi-layer fluorescent disk, an optical disk, and a magnetic disk (Fig. 1A Column 10, Lines 40-67).

As per **claim 14, 29 and 43**, Doherty discloses: installing a media identification mechanism on said computer system; utilizing said media identification mechanism to identify an instance of media disposed on said media storage device; determining a usage restriction applicable to said instance of media; and using said compliance mechanism to selectively control digitally accessing said instance of media based upon said determining (Column 8, lines 60- Column 9, Lines 30).

As per **claim 25 and 39**, Doherty discloses: wherein said usage restriction comprises a copyright restriction or licensing agreement applicable to said media (Fig. 1A and 2).

As per **claim 35**, Doherty discloses: activating a presentation mechanism coupled with said computer system for presenting said media, said presentation mechanism authorized to present said media in accordance with said compliance mechanism (Fig. 1A).

As per **claim 36**, Doherty discloses: installing a presentation mechanism on said computer system to enable said computer system to present said media, said

presentation mechanism authorized to present said media in accordance with said compliance mechanism (Fig. 1A).

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SAOUSSEN BESROUR whose telephone number is (571)272-6547. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/771,809
Art Unit: 2131

Page 10

/Ayaz R. Sheikh/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2131